



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/652,502	08/31/2000	Leon Wong	14917.1124USU1/150707.02	3677
27488	7590	06/19/2009	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)			GOLD, AVI M	
P.O. BOX 2903			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			2457	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/19/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/652,502	WONG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	AVI GOLD	2457	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 33-56 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 33-56 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is responsive to the amendment filed on April 9, 2009. Claims 33-56 were added. Claims 1-4 and 6-32 were cancelled. Claims 33-56 are pending.

### ***Response to Amendment***

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 33, 34, 41, 42, 44, 49, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. A relative priority level, a master status identifier, a second master view, customizing the prioritized plurality of client status identifiers, a customized priority level, and user-defined client status identifiers are not found in the specification.

3. Claims 34-40, 42-48, and 50-56 are necessarily rejected as being dependent upon the rejection of claims 33, 41, and 49. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claims 40, 47, 48, and 56 recite the limitation "the second master view" in the 2<sup>nd</sup> to last limitation. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

6. Claim 55 recites the limitations "the first customized priority level", "the second customized priority level", "the updated client status identifier", "the first master relative priority", and "the updated relative priority level". There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 33-38, 41-46, and 49-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunney, U.S. Patent No. 6,487,584 further in view of Shah et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,606,647.

Bunney teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a multiple personality internet account (see abstract).

As to claim 33, Bunney teaches a computer-implemented method for updating presence information for a user on a network, wherein the user accesses the network via a first client device and a second client device, the method comprising:

prioritizing a plurality of client status identifiers, wherein the plurality of client status identifiers are ordered from a lowest priority level to a highest priority level (col. 9, lines 25-35, Bunney discloses status identifiers prioritized);

receiving a first client status identifier from the first client device and a second client status identifier from the second client device (col. 1, lines 60-67, Bunney discloses an address a user has logged in with on a certain terminal);

populating a first client view with the first client status identifier and a second client view with the second client status identifier (fig. 3, Bunney discloses a table for each users multiple user profiles);

determining a first relative priority level for the first client status identifier based on the prioritized plurality of client status identifiers (col. 9, lines 1-20, Bunney discloses the server checking the table to see which address to send a notification to);

determining a second relative priority level for the second client status identifier based on the prioritized plurality of client status identifiers (col. 9, lines 1-20);

prioritizing the first client status identifier and the second client status identifier based on the first relative priority level and the second relative priority level to determine a higher client status identifier (col. 9, lines 1-20);

populating a first master view with the higher client status identifier, and wherein the first master view indicates accurate presence information for the user (col. 7, lines 5-30, col. 9, lines 25-35, Bunney discloses a user's main status shown to other users is stored at the server); and

updating the presence information of the user with the accurate presence information (col. 7, lines 5-30, col. 9, lines 25-35).

Bunney fails to teach the limitation further including the user being logged on via both clients and wherein the higher client status identifier is a first master status identifier.

However, Shah teaches a method for routing messages to achieve unified communications (see abstract). Shah teaches the use of a user logged into different computers at the same time, a log on status of users that is evaluated based on the status at the user's various computers and recent activity on them, and providing the log on status to the users (col. 5, lines 33-43, col. 12, lines 13-32, col. 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bunney in view of Shah to have a user being logged on via both clients and wherein the higher client status identifier is a first master status identifier. One would be motivated to do so because it allows the user to be logged onto multiple devices and it allows other users to find them based on their state.

Regarding claim 34, Bunney teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 33, the method further comprising:

receiving an updated client status identifier from the first client device; populating the first client view with the updated client status identifier (fig. 3, col. 7, lines 5-7; col. 9, lines 16-20);

determining an updated relative priority level for the updated client status identifier based on the prioritized plurality of client status identifiers (col. 7, lines 5-7; col. 9, lines 16-20);

determining a first master relative priority level for the first master status identifier based on the prioritized plurality of client status identifiers (col. 7, lines 5-30);

prioritizing the updated client status identifier and the first master status identifier based on the updated relative priority level and the first master relative priority level (col. 7, lines 5-7; col. 9, lines 16-20);

populating a second master view with the updated client status identifier when the updated client status identifier has a higher relative priority level than the first master status identifier, wherein the second master view indicates accurate presence information for the user (col. 7, lines 5-30, col. 9, lines 25-35); and

updating the presence information of the user with the accurate presence information (col. 7, lines 5-30, col. 9, lines 25-35).

Regarding claim 35, Bunney teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 33, the method further comprising:

receiving an updated client status identifier from the first client device  
populating the first client view with the updated client status identifier;

determining an updated relative priority level for the updated client status identifier based on the prioritized plurality of client status identifiers;

determining a first master relative priority level for the first master status identifier based on the prioritized plurality of client status identifiers;

prioritizing the updated client status identifier and the first master status identifier based on the updated relative priority level and the first master relative priority level; and

maintaining the first master status identifier in the first master view when the first master status identifier has a higher relative priority level than the updated client status identifier, wherein the first master view indicates accurate presence information for the user (fig. 3, col. 7, lines 5-30; col. 9, lines 1-35).

Regarding claim 36, Bunney teaches the computer-implemented method as defined in claim 33, wherein the plurality of client status identifiers includes one or more of: online, offline, away, invisible, busy, back soon, on phone, and at lunch (col. 7, lines 5-30).

Regarding claim 37, Bunney teaches the computer-implemented method as defined in claim 33, wherein the first client view represents presence information of the first client device and the second client view represents presence information of the second client device as detected at an associated client (col. 9, lines 1-20).

Regarding claim 38, Bunney teaches the computer-implemented method as defined in claim 33, wherein updating the presence information of the user with the accurate presence information further comprises publishing the accurate presence information to subscribers (Shah, col. 5, lines 33-43, col. 12, lines 13-32, col. 14).

As to claim 41, Bunney teaches a computer-implemented method for updating presence information for a user on a network, wherein the user accesses the network via a first client device and a second client device, the method comprising:

prioritizing a plurality of client status identifiers, wherein the plurality of client status identifiers are ordered from a lowest priority level to a highest priority level (col. 9, lines 25-35);

customizing the prioritized plurality of client status identifiers to yield a prioritized plurality of customized client status identifiers, wherein the prioritized plurality of customized client status identifiers are ordered from a lowest customized priority level to a highest customized priority level (col. 9, lines 25-35);

receiving a first client status identifier from the first client device and a second client status identifier from the second client device (col. 1, lines 60-67);

populating a first client view with the first client status identifier and a second client view with the second client status identifier (fig. 3);

determining a first customized priority level for the first client status identifier based on the prioritized plurality of customized client status identifiers (col. 9, lines 1-35);

determining a second customized priority level for the second client status identifier based on the prioritized plurality of customized client status identifiers (col. 9, lines 1-35);

prioritizing the first client status identifier and the second client status identifier based on the first customized priority level and the second customized priority level to determine a higher client status identifier (col. 9, lines 1-35);

populating a first master view with the higher client status identifier and wherein the first master view indicates accurate presence information for the user (col. 7, lines 5-30, col. 9, lines 25-35); and

updating the presence information of the user with the accurate presence information (col. 7, lines 5-30, col. 9, lines 25-35).

Bunney fails to teach the limitation further including the user being logged on via both clients and wherein the higher client status identifier is a first master status identifier.

However, Shah teaches the use of a user logged into different computers at the same time, a log on status of users that is evaluated based on the status at the user's various computers and recent activity on them, and providing the log on status to the users (col. 5, lines 33-43, col. 12, lines 13-32, col. 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bunney in view of Shah to have a user being logged on via both clients and wherein the higher client status identifier is a first master status identifier.

One would be motivated to do so because it allows the user to be logged onto multiple devices and it allows other users to find them based on their state.

Regarding claim 42, Bunney teaches the method of claim 41, further comprising:

- receiving an updated client status identifier from the first client device;
- populating the first client view with the updated client status identifier;
- determining an updated customized priority level for the updated client status identifier based on the prioritized plurality of customized client status identifiers;
- determining a first master customized priority level for the first master status identifier based on the prioritized plurality of customized client status identifiers;
- prioritizing the updated client status identifier and the first master status identifier based on the updated customized priority level and the first master customized priority level;
- populating a second master view with the updated client status identifier when the updated client status identifier has a higher customized priority level than the first master status identifier, wherein the second master view indicates accurate presence information for the user; and
- updating the presence information of the user with the accurate presence information (fig. 3, col. 7, lines 5-30; col. 9, lines 1-35).

Regarding claim 43, Bunney teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 41, the method further comprising:

receiving an updated client status identifier from the first client device;  
populating the first client view with the updated client status identifier;  
determining an updated customized priority level for the updated client status  
identifier based on the prioritized plurality of customized client status identifiers;  
determining a first master customized priority level for the first master status  
identifier based on the prioritized plurality of customized client status identifiers;  
prioritizing the updated client status identifier and the first master status identifier  
based on the updated customized priority level and the first master customized priority  
level; and  
maintaining the first master status identifier in the first master view when the first  
master status identifier has a higher customized priority level than the updated client  
status identifier, wherein the first master view indicates accurate presence information  
for the user (fig. 3, col. 7, lines 5-30; col. 9, lines 1-35).

Regarding claim 44, Bunney teaches the computer-implemented method as defined in claim 41, wherein the plurality of customized client status identifiers include one or more user-defined client status identifiers (col. 9, lines 1-35).

Regarding claim 45, Bunney teaches the computer-implemented method as defined in claim 41, wherein the first client view represents presence information of the first client device and the second client view represents presence information of the second client device as detected at an associated client (col. 9, lines 1-20).

Regarding claim 46, Bunney teaches the computer-implemented method as defined in claim 41, wherein updating the presence information of the user with the accurate presence information further comprises publishing the accurate presence information to subscribers (Shah, col. 5, lines 33-43, col. 12, lines 13-32, col. 14).

Claims 49-54 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 33-38 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

9. Claims 39 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunney and Shah in view of Aravamudan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,301,609.

Bunney teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a multiple personality internet account (see abstract). Shah teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method for routing messages to achieve unified communications (see abstract).

Regarding claim 39, Bunney and Shah teach the computer-implemented method as defined in claim 33, further comprising:

receiving the first client status identifier of "online" from the first client device and the second client status identifier of "online" from the second client device;  
populating the first client view with "online" and the second client view with "online";

determining the first relative priority level for "online" of the first client device is equivalent to the second relative priority level for "online" of the second client device based on the prioritized plurality of client status identifiers;

populating the first master view with "online";  
receiving the updated client status identifier of "offline" from the first client device;  
populating the first client view with "offline" (Bunney, fig. 3, col. 7, lines 5-30; col. 9, lines 1-35, Shah, col. 5, lines 33-43, col. 12, lines 13-32, col. 14).

Bunney and Shah fail to teach the limitation further including wherein determining the first master relative priority level for "online" of the first master view is higher than the updated relative priority level for "offline" of the first client view based on the prioritized plurality of client status identifiers; and  
maintaining "online" in the first master view, wherein the first master view indicates accurate presence information for the user.

However, Aravamudan teaches the use of instant messaging in conjunction with access to data and communication network channels and modes (see abstract). Aravamudan teaches the use of the proxy always appearing available to the buddy (col. 9, lines 64-67; col. 10, lines 1-51) and real presence being advertised to other who have identified the user as a buddy (col. 9, lines 45-67; col. 10, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bunney and Shah in view of Aravamudan wherein determining the first master relative priority level for "online" of the first master view is higher than the updated relative priority level for "offline" of the first client view based on the prioritized

plurality of client status identifiers; and maintaining "online" in the first master view, wherein the first master view indicates accurate presence information for the user. One would be motivated to do so because it would result in the most accurate presence for a user.

Regarding claim 55, Bunney and Shah teach the computer system of claim 49, further comprising:

receiving the first client status identifier of "online" from the first client device and the second client status identifier of "online" from the second client device;

populating the first client view with "online" and the second client view with "online";

determining that the first customized priority level for "online" of the first client device is equivalent to the second customized priority level for "online" of the second client device based on the prioritized plurality of client status identifiers;

populating the first master view with "online"; receiving the updated client status identifier of "offline" from the first client device; populating the first client view with "offline" (Bunney, fig. 3, col. 7, lines 5-30; col. 9, lines 1-35, Shah, col. 5, lines 33-43, col. 12, lines 13-32, col. 14).

Bunney and Shah fail to teach the limitation further including wherein determining the first master relative priority level for "online" of the first master view is higher than the updated relative priority level for "offline" of the first client view based on the

prioritized plurality of client status identifiers; and maintaining "online" in the first master view, wherein the first master view indicates accurate presence information for the user.

However, Aravamudan teaches the use of the proxy always appearing available to the buddy (col. 9, lines 64-67; col. 10, lines 1-51) and real presence being advertised to other who have identified the user as a buddy (col. 9, lines 45-67; col. 10, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bunney and Shah in view of Aravamudan wherein determining the first master relative priority level for "online" of the first master view is higher than the updated relative priority level for "offline" of the first client view based on the prioritized plurality of client status identifiers; and maintaining "online" in the first master view, wherein the first master view indicates accurate presence information for the user. One would be motivated to do so because it would result in the most accurate presence for a user.

10. Claims 40, 47, 48, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunney and Shah in view of Aravamudan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,301,609, further in view of "official notice".

Bunney teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a multiple personality internet account (see abstract). Shah teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method for routing messages to achieve unified communications (see abstract).

Regarding claim 40, Bunney and Shah teach the computer-implemented method as defined in claim 33, further comprising:

receiving the first client status identifier of "offline" from the first client device and the second client status identifier of "offline" from the second client device;

populating the first client view with "offline" and the second client view with "offline";

determining the first relative priority level for "offline" of the first client is equivalent to the second relative priority level for "offline" of the second client device based on the prioritized plurality of client status identifiers;

populating the first master view with "offline";

receiving the updated client status identifier of "idle" from the first client device;

populating the first client view with "idle" (Bunney, fig. 3, col. 7, lines 5-30; col. 9, lines 1-35, Shah, col. 5, lines 33-43, col. 12, lines 13-32, col. 14).

Bunney and Shah fail to teach the limitation further including wherein determining the updated relative priority level for "idle" of the first client view is higher than the first master relative priority level for "offline" of the first master view based on the prioritized plurality of client status identifiers; populating the second master view with "idle," wherein the second master view indicates accurate presence information for the user; and updating the presence information of the user with the accurate presence information.

However, Aravamudan teaches the use of the proxy always appearing available to the buddy (col. 9, lines 64-67; col. 10, lines 1-51) and real presence being advertised to other who have identified the user as a buddy (col. 9, lines 45-67; col. 10, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bunney and Shah in view of Aravamudan wherein determining the updated relative priority level for "idle" of the first client view is higher than the first master relative priority level for "offline" of the first master view based on the prioritized plurality of client status identifiers; populating the second master view with "idle," wherein the second master view indicates accurate presence information for the user; and updating the presence information of the user with the accurate presence information. One would be motivated to do so because it would result in the most accurate presence for a user.

Bunney and Shah also fail to teach the use of the client status identifier of "idle". "Official notice" is taken that both the concept and the advantages of a client status identifier being "idle" are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use an idle setting when a user is away from the computer for a predetermined period of time.

Regarding claim 47, Bunney and Shah teach the computer-implemented method as defined in claim 41, further comprising:

receiving the first client status identifier of "online" from the first client device and the second client status identifier of "online" from the second client device;

populating the first client view with "online" and the second client view with "online";

determining that the first customized priority level for "online" of the first client device is equivalent to the second customized priority level for "online" of the second client device based on the prioritized plurality of customized client status identifiers;

populating the first master view with "online";

receiving the updated client status identifier of "at lunch" from the first client device;

populating the first client view with "at lunch" (Bunney, fig. 3, col. 7, lines 5-30; col. 9, lines 1-35, Shah, col. 5, lines 33-43, col. 12, lines 13-32, col. 14).

Bunney and Shah fail to teach the limitation further including wherein determining the updated customized priority level for "at lunch" of the first client view is higher than the first master customized priority level for "online" of the first master view based on the prioritized plurality of customized client status identifiers; populating the second master view with "at lunch," wherein the second master view indicates accurate presence information for the user; and updating the presence information of the user with the accurate presence information.

However, Aravamudan teaches the use of the proxy always appearing available to the buddy (col. 9, lines 64-67; col. 10, lines 1-51) and real presence being advertised to other who have identified the user as a buddy (col. 9, lines 45-67; col. 10, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bunney and Shah in view of Aravamudan wherein determining the

updated customized priority level for "at lunch" of the first client view is higher than the first master customized priority level for "online" of the first master view based on the prioritized plurality of customized client status identifiers; populating the second master view with "at lunch," wherein the second master view indicates accurate presence information for the user; and updating the presence information of the user with the accurate presence information. One would be motivated to do so because it would result in the most accurate presence for a user.

Bunney and Shah also fail to teach the use of the client status identifier of "at lunch".

"Official notice" is taken that both the concept and the advantages of a client status identifier being "at lunch" are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use an "at lunch" setting when a user is at lunch as it provides the same effect as a user being away from the computer or busy.

Regarding claim 48, Bunney and Shah teach the computer-implemented method as defined in claim 41, further comprising:

receiving the first client status identifier of "on phone" from the first client device and the second client status identifier of "offline" from the second client device;

populating the first client view with "on phone" and the second client view with "offline";

determining the first customized priority level for "on phone" of the first client view is higher than the second customized priority level for "offline" of the second client

device based on the prioritized plurality of customized client status identifiers; populating the first master view with "on phone"; receiving the updated client status identifier of "online" from the first client device; populating the first client view with "online" (Bunney, fig. 3, col. 7, lines 5-30; col. 9, lines 1-35, Shah, col. 5, lines 33-43, col. 12, lines 13-32, col. 14).

Bunney and Shah fail to teach the limitation further including wherein determining the updated customized priority level for "online" of the first client view is higher than the first master customized priority level for "on phone" of the first master view based on the prioritized plurality of customized client status identifiers; populating the second master view with "online," wherein the second master view indicates accurate presence information for the user; and updating the presence information of the user with the accurate presence information.

However, Aravamudan teaches the use of the proxy always appearing available to the buddy (col. 9, lines 64-67; col. 10, lines 1-51) and real presence being advertised to other who have identified the user as a buddy (col. 9, lines 45-67; col. 10, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bunney and Shah in view of Aravamudan wherein determining the updated customized priority level for "online" of the first client view is higher than the first master customized priority level for "on phone" of the first master view based on the prioritized plurality of customized client status identifiers; populating the second master view with "online," wherein the second master view indicates accurate presence information for the user; and updating the presence information of the user with the

accurate presence information. One would be motivated to do so because it would result in the most accurate presence for a user.

Bunney and Shah also fail to teach the use of the client status identifier of "on phone".

"Official notice" is taken that both the concept and the advantages of a client status identifier being "on phone" are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use an "on phone" setting when a user on the phone as it provides the same effect as a user being away from the computer or busy.

Regarding claim 56, Bunney and Shah teach the computer system of claim 49, further comprising:

receiving the first client status identifier of "offline" from the first client device and the second client status identifier of "offline" from the second client device;

populating the first client view with "offline" and the second client view with "offline";

determining that the first customized priority level for "offline" of the first client device is equivalent to the second customized priority level for "offline" of the second client device based on the prioritized plurality of client status identifiers; populating the first master view with "offline";

receiving the updated client status identifier of "idle" from the first client device;

populating the first client view with "idle" (Bunney, fig. 3, col. 7, lines 5-30; col. 9, lines 1-35, Shah, col. 5, lines 33-43, col. 12, lines 13-32, col. 14).

Bunney and Shah fail to teach the limitation further including wherein determining the updated relative priority level for "idle" of the first client view is higher than the first master relative priority level for "offline" of the first master view based on the prioritized plurality of client status identifiers; reflecting "idle" in the second master view, wherein the second master view indicates accurate presence information for the user; and updating the presence information of the user with the accurate presence information.

However, Aravamudan teaches the use of the proxy always appearing available to the buddy (col. 9, lines 64-67; col. 10, lines 1-51) and real presence being advertised to other who have identified the user as a buddy (col. 9, lines 45-67; col. 10, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bunney and Shah in view of Aravamudan wherein determining the updated relative priority level for "idle" of the first client view is higher than the first master relative priority level for "offline" of the first master view based on the prioritized plurality of client status identifiers; reflecting "idle" in the second master view, wherein the second master view indicates accurate presence information for the user; and updating the presence information of the user with the accurate presence information.

One would be motivated to do so because it would result in the most accurate presence for a user.

Bunney and Shah also fail to teach the use of the client status identifier of "idle". "Official notice" is taken that both the concept and the advantages of a client status identifier being "idle" are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to

one skilled in the art to use an idle setting when a user is away from the computer for a predetermined period of time.

***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 33-56 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,564,261 to Gudjonsson et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,519,639 to Glasser et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,148,328 to Cuomo et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,943,478 to Aggarwal et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,909,543 to Tanaka et al.

U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0198952 to Bell.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,463,471 to Dreke et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,825,864 to McGraw et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,757,901 to Hiroshige.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,697,840 to Godefroid et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,315,636 to Patel.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,678,719 to Stimmel.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,668,167 to McDowell et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,596,633 to Meier et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,389,127 to Vardi et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,473,098 to Wakai et al.

U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0042126 to Wong et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,658,095 to Yoakum et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,668,173 to Greene.

U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0019942 to Wakai et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,141,662 to Jeyachandran

U.S. Pat. No. 6,549,937 to Auerbach et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,764,639 to Staples et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,678,719 to Stimmel

U.S. Pat. No. 6,349,327 to Tang et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AVI GOLD whose telephone number is (571)272-4002. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:30 (1st Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/A. G./

Examiner, Art Unit 2457

/ARIO ETIENNE/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457